

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 20, 2004. Claims 25-32 are presented for examination, of which Claim 25 is in independent form. Claims 25, 26, 28, 29, and 31 have been amended to define Applicants' invention more clearly.¹ New Claim 32 has been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

In the Office Action dated January 20, 2004, Claims 25-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,313,875 (*Suga et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,100,812 (*Tanaka et al.*); and Claim 31 was rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Suga et al.* in view of *Tanaka et al.* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,522,354 (*Kawamura et al.*).

Amended Claim 25 is directed to a method of remotely controlling an image capture apparatus. The method includes a reception step, a shape selection step, an area setting step, and a first command sending step. In the reception step, a captured image is received from the image capture apparatus. In the shape selection step, a shape of a frame to be set within the captured image is selected. In the area setting step, an area of the frame is set. In the first command sending step, the first command is sent to the image capture apparatus.

The control method of Claim 25 includes several important features such as (i) selecting a shape of a frame to be set within a captured image, (ii) setting an area of the frame,

¹ Support for the amendments to the claims can be found at, for example, Fig. 2, p. 16 at lines 7-19, and p. 26 beginning at line 4.

and (iii) sending a first command to the image capture apparatus, which command includes data indicating the selected shape and the set area.

As previously noted in the Amendment filed on November 5, 2003, *Suga et al.* relates to a video system in which a camera is controlled by a control apparatus via a communication network, such as an ISDN (see lines 19-23 of column 1). Figs. 12A-12D of *Suga et al.* discloses that a remote terminal sets a rectangular frame and sends data of the set frame to a camera (col. 10, lines 18-44 and Figs. 12A-12D).

Although *Suga et al.* may be well suited for its intended purpose, it does not teach or suggest selecting a shape of a frame to be set, let alone sending a first command to the image capture apparatus, wherein the first command includes data indicating the selected shape and the set area, as set forth in Claim 25. As such, Claim 25 is believed to be patentable over *Suga et al.*

Tanaka et al. is understood by Applicants to relate to a communication control system for remotely controlling a target apparatus, e.g. video tape recorder (VTR). *Tanaka et al.* is further understood to disclose transmitting a control command to the target apparatus via an IEEE-1394 serial bus (see column 6, lines 15-29, and Fig. 1).

However, Applicants have found nothing in *Tanaka et al.* that teaches or suggests the step of selecting a shape of a frame to be set, as set forth in Claim 25.

As such, *Suga et al.* and *Tanaka et al.*, whether considered separately or in combination, assuming such a combination would even be permissible, also would fail to teach or suggest a step of selecting a shape of a frame to be set, as set forth in Claim 25. Therefore, Claim 25 is

believed to be patentable over *Suga et al.* and *Tanaka et al.*, whether considered separately or in combination.


A review of the other art of record, including *Kawamura et al.*, has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above as referenced against Claim 25 herein. Claim 25 is therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application depend from Claim 25 and therefore are submitted to be patentable for at least the above reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,496

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200